

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

7 MAUREEN FORS,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

11 Defendant.

Case No. C19-1520 RSM

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO AMEND BRIEFING
SCHEDULE**

12
13 This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's third Agreed Motion for Order Amending
14 Briefing Schedule. Dkt. 20. Having already been granted one extension based on unforeseen
15 circumstances, plaintiff's opening brief was due February 28, 2020. *See* Dkt. 17. On the
16 afternoon of February 28, 2020, plaintiff requested a second extension to complete her brief,
17 providing no reason for the request. *See* Dkt. 18. The Court noted plaintiff's motion violated
18 local rules requiring motions for relief from a deadline, barring unforeseen emergencies, to "be
19 filed sufficiently in advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion *prior to the*
20 *deadline.*" Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(j) (emphasis added). The Court stated that sanctions
21 would be considered if plaintiff's counsel continued to violate local rules. Dkt. 19 at 2.
22 Nevertheless, the Court granted the motion so as not to prejudice to plaintiff, making plaintiff's
23 opening brief due March 9, 2020. *Id.* On March 10, 2020, plaintiff filed the instant motion,
again violating local rules by untimely filing and failing to provide a reason establishing

1 unforeseen circumstances. Moreover, all three of plaintiff's motions to amend the briefing
2 schedule violated local rules requiring a moving party to file "a proposed order" along with a
3 motion and to submit a "Word or WordPerfect compatible" version of the proposed order to the
4 assigned judge's e-mail address. LCR 7(b)(1); Electronic Filing Procedures for Civil and
5 Criminal Cases Amended 1/17/2020, III(M), <https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/attorneys/cmecf>;
6 *see* LCR 5(d) (requiring compliance with Electronic Filing Procedures).

7 "An attorney or party who without just cause fails to comply with ... [the local] rules, or
8 an order of the court, or who presents to the court unnecessary motions ..., or who otherwise so
9 multiplies or obstructs the proceedings in a case may, in addition to or in lieu of the sanctions
10 and penalties provided elsewhere in these rules, ... be subject to such other sanctions as the court
11 may deem appropriate." LCR 11(c). The Court concludes an appropriate sanction is to deny
12 plaintiff's motion until such time plaintiff's counsel complies with local rules.

13 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED** without prejudice.

14 DATED this 11th day of March 2020.

15 

16 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
17 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23